

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/666,380 | AVNERY, TZVI | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Kishor Mayekar | 1753 | |

All Participants:

(1) Kishor Mayekar.

(2) Darrell Wong.

Status of Application: _____

(3) Nam Nguyen.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 7 March 2007

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Informed the Attorney that an Office action mailed on 21 September 2006 however returned back to USPTO on 2 October 2006 as undelivered. The Attorney agrees to file a petition for the remail upon consulting with SPE Nam Nguyen this morning.

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)